arXiv:1601.05555v2 [quant-ph] 25 Jan 2016

A top-down versus a bottom-up hidden-variables description of the Stern-Gerlach experiment

M. Arsenijević[†], J. Jeknić-Dugić[*], M. Dugić[†]

[*]Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Niš, Serbia

[†]Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Kragujevac, Serbia

Abstract We employ the Stern-Gerlach experiment to highlight the basics of a minimalist, non-interpretational top-down approach to quantum foundations. Certain benefits of the here highlighted "quantum structural studies" are detected and discussed. While the top-down approach can be described without making any reference to the fundamental structure of a closed system, the hidden variables theory á la Bohm proves to be more subtle than it is typically regarded.

1. Introduction

Reductionist, i.e. bottom up, thinking is prominent in physics: Features and dynamics of the structural components (subsystems), all the way down to the elementary particles, are assumed to exhaust the description of the features and dynamics of the whole. Huge success of application of physical theories seem to weaken the possible merits of the question: What might be wrong with the physical reductionism?

However, there are indications that this "wrong" is rather subtle considering that reductionism may be not the "whole story". On one hand, efficient physical description of many-particle systems is lacking [1]. On the other hand, even the orthodox "quantum" systems may hide subtleties in their structural description, given entanglement and other features of "quantum wholeness". It may be more realistic to allow native variables for quantum composites.

In the context of the universally valid and complete quantum mechanics not extended by any additional rules or (e.g. interpretational) assumptions [2]:

"*Without further physical assumption, no partition has an ontologically superior status with respect to any other.*"

as well as [3]:

"*However, for many macroscopic systems, and in particular for the universe as a whole, there may be no natural split into distinguished subsystems and the rest, and another way of identifying the naturally decoherent variables is required.*".

The apparent lack of preferred structure (partition into subsystems) of a closed quantum system yields a top-down approach to quantum structures, cf. e.g. [4] (and references therein).

In the context of the universally valid but incomplete quantum theory, the things may look the opposite. For example, in the de Broglie-Bohm quantum theory, the particles are assumed to define the physically fundamental (ontic) structure of the Universe [5]. This kind of structuralism is bottom-up that *supplements* the standard quantum mechanical formalism.

Hence the foundational character of the quantum structure studies and particularly of the topical questions highlighting this Volume that can be shortly expressed as "How components relate to a composite?". Scientific relevance of this question stands even without any reference to "applications", since majority of the working physicists agree that [6]
"*But our present [quantum mechanical] formalism is not purely epistemological; it is a peculiar mixture describing in part realities of Nature, in part incomplete human information about Nature — all scrambled up by Heisenberg and Bohr into an omelette that nobody has seen how to unscramble. Yet we think that the unscrambling is a prerequisite for any further advance in basic physical theory. For, if we cannot separate the subjective and objective aspects of the formalism, we cannot know what we are talking about; it is just that simple.*"

In this paper we contrast a top-down with an bottom-up (hidden-variables) description of the illustrious Stern-Gerlach experiment. Contrasting each other, these descriptions highlight the quantum structure studies (QSS) as a useful tool in the foundations and interpretation of quantum theory that is our main goal. Certain ramifications of the observations made in this paper will be elaborated elsewhere.

2. Outlines of a top-down approach to quantum structures

This Volume covers the different top-down approaches and interpretations of quantum structures, see e.g. [7]. In this section we briefly overview perhaps the simplest one, which equates "quantum structure" with the "tensor product structure [of the composite system's Hilbert space]" [4] (and references therein).

In the universally valid and complete quantum theory[1], every set of the *linearly independent and commuting* degrees of freedom, $\{q_i\}$, defines a tensor-product structure for the system's Hilbert space:

[1]To be precise, by "universally valid and complete quantum theory" we have in mind the standard nonrelativistic formalism not extended or amended by any additional assumptions or interpretational elements.

$$\mathcal{H} = \otimes_i \mathcal{H}_i, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_i$ concerns the ith degree of freedom[2].

By "alternative degrees of freedom" we assume the sets of *arbitrary* degrees of freedom, which are mutually linked via the invertible linear canonical transformations (LTS), e.g.

$$\xi_m = \sum_i \kappa_{mi} q_i, \tag{2}$$

and analogously for the conjugated momentums (if these exist). For the unitary matrix (κ_{mi}) applies the constraint $\sum_l \kappa_{li}\kappa_{lm} = \delta_{im}$ for real κs.

Then the two sets of the degrees of freedom, $\{q_i\}$ and $\{\xi_m\}$, define a pair of structures of the composite system.

To illustrate, consider the paradigmatic example of the hydrogen atom, which is defined as a pair of quantum particles "electron" and "proton" via the respective position observables $\vec{r}_e$, $\vec{r}_p$. However, this structure, $e + p \equiv \{\vec{r}_e, \vec{r}_p\}$, is not the only one possible. Rather, it is typically regarded the alternative atomic "center of mass + relative particle" $(CM + R)$ structure that is defined by the respective position observables, $\vec{R}_{CM}$ and $\vec{\rho}_R$. The structural transition [8]

$$e + p \to CM + R \tag{3}$$

is due to the (invertible) linear canonical transformations:

$$\vec{R}_{CM} = \frac{m_e\vec{r}_e + m_p\vec{r}_p}{m_e + m_p}, \vec{\rho}_R = \vec{r}_e - \vec{r}_p, \tag{4}$$

and with the tensor re-factorization:

$$\mathcal{H}_e \otimes \mathcal{H}_p = \mathcal{H}_{CM} \otimes \mathcal{H}_R. \tag{5}$$

All kinds and types of the LTS-induced structures are of interest in the context of the universally valid and complete quantum theory. For closed quantum systems (subjected to the Schrödinger law), there is no priviledged (preferred) structure, Section 1. However, for open quantum systems, it is often conjectured, e.g. [9], and sometimes justified [8, 10, 11] existence of a preferred structure (decomposition into subsystems) due to the environmental influence. Sometimes, the preferred structure is postulated [12] or expected to exist due to the additional symmetry-based requirements, see e.g. [13].

[2]Notice that a factor-space $\mathcal{H}_i$ may refer to a particle's spin as a vector observable.

In general, *locality* is clearly defined for every possible subsystem of a composite (total) system: Tensor-factorization of the composite system's Hilbert space uniquely defines *local observables* for every subsystem. For example, any observable A of the atomic CM system is defined $A_{CM} \otimes I_R$ and, according to eq.(4), is a "collective" observable regarding the atomic $e+p$ structure. Equivalently, any observable B for the atomic proton is local for the $e+p$ structure in the form of $B_p \otimes I_e$ and is a "collective" observable for the atomic $CM+R$ structure. Therefore, as long as a measurement of the $A_{CM} \otimes I_R$ observable can induce non-local effects for the $e+p$ structure, it never–by definition–induces any influence on the atomic R system.

It is essential to note that the tensor-product nonlocality is more general than nonlocality often regarded in the context of interpretation of Bell inequalities. An action exerted on e.g. the atomic CM system *only partially interrupts the atomic electron and proton*. This is a direct consequence of eq.(4): according to eq.(4), to say that both electron and proton are simultaneously influenced by an action *implies* that the atomic CM and R systems are also *both* simultaneously influenced by that action. Therefore, a local action on the atomic CM or R systems does not influence either the electron or the proton, except partially, and *vice versa*. Hence we can conclude that the here introduced concept of locality is a prerequisite for the locality vs. nonlocality studies regarding the Bell inequalities, which assume a fixed bipartite structure of a composite system.

At this point, this version of the top-down approach to quantum structures directly tackles the so-called Tsirelson's problem [14] and also naturally calls for the analysis in the context of the so-called Categorical quantum theory, e.g. [15]–that here will not be considered. The secondary role of "quantum subsystems", which lack independent individuality, is exhibited by the so-called "parallel occurrence of decoherence" on the purely formal level in the context of the standard environment-induced decoherence theory [16]. Simultaneous unfolding of the mutually irreducible decoherence processes regarding different (mutually irreducible) structures of a single closed system [16] is the price that must be paid as long as quantum theory is considered to be universal and complete in a non-interpretational context.

3. The Stern-Gerlach experiment in the universally valid and complete quantum mechanics

Now we are prepared to give a top-down description of the Stern-Gerlach experiment for arbitrary atom not carrying a net electric charge.

Consider an atom as a set of electrons and the atomic nucleus, which is typically considered as a point-like (non-structured) quantum particle. The

atom's Hamiltonian:

$$H = \sum_i \frac{\vec{p}_{ei}^2}{2m_e} + \frac{\vec{p}_{nucl}^2}{2m_{nucl}} - k\sum_i \frac{Ze^2}{|\vec{x}_{ei} - \vec{x}_{nucl}|} + V \tag{6}$$

with the obvious notation and the V stands for all the (weaker) Coulomb- and spin-interactions between the particles that can be treated as the gross perturbation term. Eq. (6) defines the following tensor-factorization of the atomic Hilbert state-space:

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_e \otimes \mathcal{H}_n \otimes \mathcal{H}_{spin}, \tag{7}$$

where the atomic spin state-space, $\mathcal{H}_{spin}$, is assumed to be isomorphic to the single-electron's spin-1/2 space and the remaining factor spaces concern the standard "orbital" (spatial) degrees of freedom of the electrons (e) and of the atomic nucleus (n) systems.

However, the standard theoretical model [5] of the Stern-Gerlach experiment regards the alternative "center-of-mass+internal (relative)" atomic structure for the spatial degrees of freedom. This structural change[3], $e+n \to CM + R$, induces refactorization of the Hilbert state-space

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{CM} \otimes \mathcal{H}_R \otimes \mathcal{H}_{spin} \tag{8}$$

as well as the alternative form of the atomic Hamiltonian, $H = \frac{\vec{P}_{CM}^2}{2M} + \sum_i \vec{p}_{Ri}^2/2\mu_i + V_{Coul} + V$ where the μ_is represent the "reduced masses" while V_{Coul} is the nucleus-induced classical Coulomb field for the R system's degrees of freedom [4, 8]. Neglecting the weak term V and bearing in mind eq.(3), the Hamiltonian exhibits the variables separation:

$$H = \frac{\vec{P}_{CM}^2}{2M} \otimes I_R \otimes I_{spin} + I_{CM} \otimes H_R \otimes I_{spin}, \tag{9}$$

where the internal atomic energy $H_R = \sum_i \vec{p}_{Ri}^2/2\mu_i + V_{Coul}$.

Placing the atom in a sufficiently strong magnetic field along the z-axis is modelled by the interaction term for the $CM + spin$ system [5]:

$$H_{CM+spin} = -\vec{\mu}_{spin} \cdot \vec{B}(Z_{CM}), \tag{10}$$

where $\vec{\mu}_{spin} = -\mu\vec{S}$ is the atomic-spin magnetic dipole; if we apply the standard approximation $\vec{\mu}_{spin} \approx \vec{\mu}_e$, then the constant $\mu = \mu_B$ is the standard "Bohr magneton" and $\vec{S}$ is the spin of the electron.

[3] A generalization of eq.(4).

From eqs.(9), (10) it directly follows that the unitary dynamics of the atom induces quantum entanglement between the atomic CM and "spin" systems, while the absence of interaction between the R system with the CM and the "spin" system allows for the "separation" of the R system's state from the rest in the form of:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \left(\sum_i c_i |i\rangle_{CM} \otimes |i\rangle_{spin} \right) \otimes |\chi\rangle_R, \tag{11}$$

in an instant of time t; for the spatial $i = +, -$, [indicating the above and below the XY-plane], the spin states $i = \downarrow, \uparrow$, respectively, and $c_i = 2^{-1/2}$.

Bearing in mind Section 2, the physical meaning of eq.(11) is rather obvious:
($\mathcal{S}$) *Magnetic field* locally *acts on the atomic CM system, while leaving the atomic internal (the R) system intact.*
To the extent that eq.(11) captures the phenomenology, the same can be told for the statement $\mathcal{S}$.

This trivial observation carries a non-trivial content regarding the atomic $e+n$ structure. Actually, bearing in mind Section 2, the $\mathcal{S}$ statement straightforwardly implies the following observation:
($\mathcal{O}$) *Neither the electrons* (e) *nor the atomic nucleus* (n) *are influenced by the magnetic field.*

The statement $\mathcal{O}$ is easily proved as a repetition of the arguments of Section 2: Assume that the magnetic field "sees" both the atomic electrons and the atomic nucleus. Then an influence exerted on the electrons positions, $\vec{r}_i$, *and* on the nucleus position, $\vec{r}_n$, in analogy with eq.(4), directly gives rise to the conclusion that *both* the atomic CM and R systems are influenced by the magnetic field–in contradiction with eq.(11) i.e. with $\mathcal{S}$.

Therefore, equal status of every (physically reasonable) structure of a composite system *implies* the purely local influence of the magnetic field. Furthermore, this influence cannot be precisely described for the atomic $e+n$ structure as, due to $\mathcal{S}$ and in analogy with eq.(4), both e and n are only "partially" seen by the magnetic field.

4. A hidden-variables description of the Stern-Gerlach experiment

Influence of the magnetic field on the atomic e and n systems cannot be imagined in the universally valid and complete quantum theory–the statement $\mathcal{O}$ of Section 3. Hence assuming
($\mathcal{S}'$) *Magnetic field locally acts on the atomic e and p systems, independently.*

directly leads to the conclusion that there are certain *hidden variables* in the description of the atom in the Stern-Gerlach experiment. That is, a "non-hidden" influence of the magnetic field implies the above statement $\mathcal{S}$, i.e. the $\mathcal{O}$ of the previous section, not to be correct.

It is natural to assume that the electrons-system and the nucleus positions, $\vec{r}_i$ and $\vec{r}_n$, respectively, can play the roles of "hidden variables" (HV). Assuming the ontic status of those variables like in the Bohm's theory [5], it is possible qualitatively to devise a scenario in which the standard description, eq.(11), applies and still to describe the influence of the field on *both* the e and n atomic systems. For simplicity, consider the hydrogen atom described by eq.(11). Then it's easy to imagine that the external magnetic field $\vec{B}$ drives both the electron and the proton so as to have the dynamical change of the CM + *spin* system as described by eq.(11), while the relative distance between the e and p is determined by the probability density $|\chi(\vec{\rho}_R)|^2$; $\vec{\rho}_R = \vec{r}_e - \vec{r}_p$, cf. Section 2 for the notation.

Needless to say, in this picture, the alternative atomic structure $CM + R$ is artificial–simply a mathematical artifact without any physical meaning. Just like in classical physics, this structure can be used to ease mathematical manipulation, while all the physically relevant results must be expressed in the terms of the fundamental degrees of freedom, of $\vec{r}_e$ and $\vec{r}_p$.

The magnetic field eq.(10), which is of the form $\vec{B}(Z_{CM} \otimes I_{spin})$ for the $CM + R$ structure, can represent an interaction term for the atomic $e + p$ structure: $\vec{B}\left((m_e z_e \otimes I_p + m_p I_e \otimes z_p)/M\right)$; $M = m_e + m_p$. This interaction would produce entanglement for the e and p even if there were not the Coulomb interaction in the $e + p$ structure. That is, regarding the atomic $e + p$ structure, eq.(11) takes the form[4]:

$$\sum_i c_i |\psi_i\rangle_{e+p} \otimes |\chi_i\rangle_{spin} = |\Psi\rangle = \sum_i c_i \left(\sum_\alpha d^i_\alpha |\alpha\rangle_e \otimes |\alpha\rangle_p \right) \otimes |\chi_i\rangle_{spin}, \quad (12)$$

as an example of Entanglement Relativity [4, 18] (and references therein).

By definition, eq.(12) is *insensitive* to the fundamental (*subquantum*) influence of the magnetic field on the atomic e and p subsystems and can be assumed to give rise to the subquantum (HV) probability density with purely classical correlations [that are induced by the Coulomb and/or the external magnetic field], of the general form of:

[4]The adiabatic cut of the electron from the proton due to $m_e/M \ll 1$ would not change our argument even if numerically justified, see Ref. [4] for more details.

$$\mu(\lambda) = \sum_i p_i f_{1i}(\vec{r}_e) f_{2i}(\vec{r}_p). \tag{13}$$

If normalized, the local probability densities f_is imply $\sum_i p_i = 1$, while $\int \mu(\lambda) d\lambda = 1$.

Hence a HV theory á la Bohm can be summarized by the following observation while taking over the meaning of "locality" from Section 3:
($\mathcal{O}'$) *Both the electrons* (e) *and the atomic nucleus* (n) *systems are* locally *influenced by the magnetic field so as that cannot be observed on the quantum level of* eq.(12).

5. Discussion

Quantum structural studies (QSS) of Section 2 are *minimalist* in that they neither extend nor interpret the standard quantum mechanical formalism. In this sense, QSS introduce a non-standard methodology in the standard quantum theory with the following benefits.

First, the very basic QSS concept of *locality*, Section 2, is a prerequisite of the locality (i.e. of "local causality") á la Bell [17] and is compatible with the "non-locality" in a hidden-variables theories á la Bohm [17]–cf. ($\mathcal{O}'$), Section 4. Therefore different contents of "locality" are naturally linked through the quantum structural studies.

Second, on the *ontological level*, QSS as per Section 2 is in sharp contrast with the reductionistic interpretations of quantum theory á la Bohm [5, 17]. Distinguishing between these two approaches to quantum theory may be seen as an amendment to the tests of the Bell inequalities [17]: one should simultaneously consider more than one composite-system's structure, which leads to the following observation.

Third, all the structural considerations are by definition *contextual*. Regarding the atom as a whole, all observables of every single atomic subsystem are the atomic observables too. However, measurements that are local relative to one atomic structure need not imply any information regarding an alternative atomic structure. Capturing the atoms impinging on a screen directly reveals the atomic CM position on the screen but does not provide any information regarding the atomic R system. Thus the Stern-Gerlach experiment is local relative to the $CM+R$ structure and does not provide much information regarding the atomic $e+p$ structure. Therefore, the concept of contextuality is also extended, i.e. in a sense generalized: it does not assume exclusively a single (fixed) structure of a composite system and also allows for the mutually compatible observables, cf. e.g. eq.(4).

Fourth, while eqs.(12) and (13) are compatible, they are still limited from the point of view of the quantum structural studies. Simultaneous consideration of the physically fundamental and artificial structures pose specific constraints on the HV theories as per Section 3. To see this, consider the asymptotic limit of the hydrogen atom–i.e. a pair of the free noninteracting electron and proton–out of any external field. The "natural" choice of the classical density probability

$$\mu(\lambda) = f_1(\vec{r}_e) f_2(\vec{r}_p) \tag{14}$$

implies a conflict with the standard task of introducing the artificial $CM + R$ structure, eq.(4). Actually, as a classical counterpart of the quantum correlations relativity [4, 18], typically:

$$f_1(\vec{r}_e) f_2(\vec{r}_p) = \mu(\lambda) = \sum_i q_i g_{1i}(\vec{R}_{CM}) g_{2i}(\vec{\rho}_R) \neq G_1(\vec{R}_{CM}) G_2(\vec{\rho}_R), \tag{15}$$

which is in contrast with the standard task of "variables separation" (and integrability) in classical mechanics. That is, mutually separated CM and R systems are typically described by the rhs of eq.(15).

Conversely, the inverse of eq.(14):

$$G_1(\vec{R}_{CM}) G_2(\vec{\rho}_R) = \mu'(\lambda) = \sum_i p_i f_{1i}(\vec{r}_e) f_{2i}(\vec{r}_p) \neq f_1(\vec{r}_e) f_2(\vec{r}_p), \tag{16}$$

challenges the above-distinguished "natural" choice of eq.(14).

Thereby a choice for the probability density $\mu(\lambda)$ becomes not as free as it may seem in the standard HV theories. Despite the fact that the alternative structures are artificial, the simple *mathematical* considerations as per eqs. (13)-(16) confine the considerations in a non-trivial way yet fully to be explored. In the context of the Stern-Gerlach experiment, this choice should be accompanied with eq.(11) and eq.(12) while bearing in mind that eq.(11) describes the *operationally accessible* [2] situation.

It is worth repeating: Structure of a composite system is conditional in the universally valid and complete quantum theory, Section 2. As distinct from the prevailing reductionistic wisdom, the quantum structural studies of Section 2 highlight existence of a preferred structure of an *open* quantum system as a *relational* concept. There is nothing in the formalism as well as in the physical ontological basis that could suggest the ontologically superior status of any structure of a closed composite quantum system. Thus the quantum structural studies as per Section 2 directly challenge the standard

physical conceptualization embodied in the concept of "elementary particles" [4, 17]: *In the non-relativistic domain, quantum formalism can properly work even without assuming the ontological status of elementary particles.*

This brings us to the following mathematical forms of the basic task of the quantum structural studies. On one hand, it's the so-called Tsirelson's problem [14]: Whether or not a composite system's state space is built via the tensor-product structures as assumed in QSS? And the corollary: What if the tensor-product structures have an alternative–what is the meaning of "locality" in that new, hypothetical discourse? As another natural frame for the quantum structural studies we emphasize the Category studies [15], in which *correlations* are primary and "*correlata*" (subsystems) are secondary. This is a natural framework for the emerging approach of "there are no particles" to quantum foundations [4, 19].

From the purely operational point of view, QSS elevate the following seemingly "philosophical" issue: How can we be sure in a concrete physical situation which degrees of freedom of a composite system have been targeted by our apparatus(es)? The natural assumption that acquiring information about a composite system is limited to a "small" set of the system's degrees of freedom *implies* locality as per Section 2. On one hand, measurement of the proton's position in the hydrogen atom gives a close value for the atomic CM position but introduces entanglement for the CM and R systems, cf. eq.(4), that in principle can be experimentally tested. Hence non-equivalence of measurements of the proton and the CM system's positions that instantiates locality of Section 2. On the other hand, targeting *both* the e and p atomic systems also provides an information regarding the positions of the formal systems $\vec{R}_{CM}$ and $\vec{\rho}_R$ [contextual measurements with only linear increase in uncertainties for $\vec{R}_{CM}$ and $\vec{\rho}_R$]. Hence the "total" measurements–of the pair $\vec{r}_e, \vec{r}_p$ (or of the pair $\vec{R}_{CM}, \vec{\rho}_R$)–on the atom are practically equivalent.

Now the point strongly to be stressed is that quantum uncertainty, i.e. the non-increase of information regarding the related conjugate momentums, may appear as a kind of *limitation* in the physical process of *measurement* (that is understood as the process of acquiring information), not necessarily of the fundamental physical description of the atomic e and p subsystems. In effect, the quantum part of the theory, eq.(12), may be *not a fundamental* but an emergent description of the quantum system called "atom" *due to the process of acquiring information* now crying for explanation and called "measurement". In our opinion, the dichotomy of "particles + quantum field" [5] is a suitable phrase, not a satisfying explanation yet. This position is in contrast to that of Bell's [20], which discards foundational importance of the quantum measurement process. To this end, setting "measurement"

as a purely operational concept [21, 22] makes the two competing theories (Bohm [5] versus Qubism [22]) virtually indistinguishable everywhere except possibly on the operationally-inaccessible ontological level.

Operationally again, QSS are sometimes reduced to the topic of experimental accessibility of the composite system's observables [2]. While "accessibility" assumes the preferred tensor-product structure, which may be environment-induced [8-11], there appear the following subtleties. On one hand, not all observables of a subsystem pertaining to a preferred structure of the composite system are on the equal physical footing. To this end, the symmetry of the open system's effective Hamiltonian [23] may be decisive–not only a choice between the noncommuting e.g. "position" and "momentum" (or energy) observables should be made, but also a choice between the commuting observables defining "object" (e.g. the Descartes vs spherical degrees of freedom) are of interest [24]. On the other hand, the environmental influence is typically approximate and hence one may expect some "emergent" degrees of freedom [25].

This brings us to the following answers to the topical questions of this Volume. The familiar classical center-of-mass degrees of freedom are environment-induced, relationally realistic and operationally accessible degrees of freedom, which do not require any ontologically superior subquantum degrees of freedom. Hence the transition from quantum to classical regards the specific, *local* degrees of freedom that, we believe, may be at the core of the other aspects of the problem of "transition from quantum to classical" [9]. In other words, a part of the problem may reside on the assumption that the problem must be solved in the terms of the "fundamental" (ontological) structure of a composite system. Unfortunately, we are not aware nor do we offer an elaborated experimental proposal in this regard.

While quantum structural studies challenge [26] the interpretations á la Everett [25, 27], the discourses regarding the non-universally valid quantum theory [28] as well as "the problem of time" [29-31] (and references therein) are in order. To this end, the work is in progress and the results will be presented elsewhere.

Acknowledgements We benefited much from discussions with Ruth Kastner. Financial support from Ministry of Science Serbia grant no 171028 is acknowledged, as well as for MD by the ICTP - SEENET-MTP project PRJ-09 Cosmology and Strings in frame of the SEENET-MTP Network.

[1] S. Y. Auyang, *Foundations of Complex-system Theories*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998

[2] P. Zanardi, Virtual quantum subsystems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 077901 (2001)

[3] J. Halliwell, Emergence of hydrodynamic behaviour. In *Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality*, S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, D. Wallace (eds.), Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010, pp. 99-117.

[4] J. Jeknić-Dugić, M. Arsenijević, M. Dugić, *Quantum Structures. A View of the Quantum World*, LAP Lambert Scientific Publishing, Saarbrücken, 2013; also available at e-print arXiv arXiv:1306.5471 [quant-ph]

[5] D. Bohm, *Quantum Theory*, Prentice Hall, New York, 1951

[6] E. T. Jaynes, In *Complexity, Entropy, and the Physics of Information*, W. H. Zurek (ed.), Addison-Wesley, 1990, p. 381

[7] S. Fortin, O. Lombardi, A top-down view of the classical limit of quantum mechanics, forthcoming in Kastner R E, Jeknić-Dugić J, Jaroszkiewicz G, eds., *Quantum Structural Studies.* Singapore: World Scientific Publishers, 2016.

[8] J. Jeknić-Dugić, M. Dugić, A. Francom, M. Arsenijević, Quantum Structures of the Hydrogen Atom, *Open Access Library Journal* **1**, e501 (2014)

[9] D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, J. Kupsch, I.-O. Stamatescu, H. D. Zeh, *Decoherence and the appearance of a classical world in quantum theory*, Spinger, Berlin, 1996

[10] M. Arsenijević, J. Jeknić-Dugić, M. Dugić, Asymptotic dynamics of the alternate degrees of freedom for a two-mode system: an analytically solvable model, *Chinese Phys. B* **22**, 020302 (2013)

[11] A. Stokes, A. Kurcz, T. P. Spiller, A. Beige, Extending the validity range of quantum optical master equations, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 053805 (2012)

[12] W. H. Zurek, Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 715 (2003)

[13] N. L. Harshman, Symmetry and Natural Quantum Structures for Three-Particles in One-Dimension, forthcoming in Kastner R E, Jeknić-Dugić J, Jaroszkiewicz G, eds., *Quantum Structural Studies.* Singapore: World Scientific Publishers, 2016.

[14] B. S. Tsirelson, Some results and problems on quantum Bell-type inequalities, *Hadronic J. Suppl.* **8**, 329345 (1993)

[15] B. Coecke, A. Kissinger, Categorical Quantum Mechanics I: Causal Quantum Processes, e-print arXiv arXiv:1510.05468 [quant-ph]

[16] M. Dugić, J. Jeknić-Dugić, Parallel decoherence in composite quantum systems, *Pramana* **79**, 199 (2012)

[17] H. M. Wiseman, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **47**, 424001 (2014)

[18] M. Dugić, M. Arsenijević, J. Jeknić-Dugić, Quantum correlations relativity, *Sci. China, Phys. Mech. Astron.* **56**, 732 (2014)

[19] H. D. Zeh, There are no Quantum Jumps, nor are there Particles, *Phys. Lett. A* **172**, 189 (1993)

[20] J. S. Bell, Against "Measurement", In *Sixty-Two Years of Uncertainty Historical, Philosophical, and Physical Inquiries into the Foundations of Quantum Mechanics*, Arthur I. Miller (ed), NATO ASI Series Volume 226 1990, pp. 17-31

[21] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000

[22] C. A. Fuchs, N. David Mermin, R. Schack, An Introduction to QBism with an Application to the Locality of Quantum Mechanics, *Am. J. Phys.* **82**, 749 (2014)

[23] N. L. Harshman, S. Wickramasekara, Galilean and Dynamical Invariance of Entanglement in Particle Scattering *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 080406 (2007)

[24] W. H. Zurek, Preferred States, Predictability, Classicality and the Environment-Induced Decoherence, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **89**, 281 (1993)

[25] D. Wallace, *Emergent Multiverse: Quantum Theory According to the Everett Interpretation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012

[26] J. Jeknić-Dugić, M. Dugić, A. Francom, Quantum Structures of a Model-Universe: Questioning the Everett Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **53**, 169

[27] S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A Kent, D. Wallace (Eds.), *Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010.

[28] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, T. Weber, Unified dynamics for microscopic and macroscopic systems, *Phys. Rev. D* **34**, 470, 1986

[29] J. Jeknić-Dugić, M. Arsenijević, M. Dugić, A local-time-induced pointer basis, *Proc. R. Soc. A* **470**, 20140283 (2014) .

[30] J. Jeknić-Dugić, M. Arsenijević, M. Dugić, Dynamical emergence of Markovianity in Local Time Scheme, e-print arXiv arXiv:1510.02913 [quant-ph]

[31] C. Baumgarten, Minkowski Spacetime and QED from Ontology of Time, forthcoming in Kastner R E, Jeknić-Dugić J, Jaroszkiewicz G, eds., *Quantum Structural Studies*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishers, 2016.